

RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER

JUL 18 2007

REMARKS

In view of the above amendments and the following remarks, reconsideration of the rejections contained in the Office Action of April 18, 2007 is respectfully requested.

By this Amendment, claims 1-5, 8-18, 20, 22, 24, 25, 28 and 30 have been cancelled. In addition, claims 19, 21, 23 and 29 have been amended, and new claims 32-37 have been added. Thus, claims 6, 7, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 31-37 are currently pending in the application. No new matter has been added by these amendments.

The entire specification and abstract have been reviewed and revised. Due to the number of revisions, the amendments to the specification and abstract have been incorporated into the attached substitute specification and abstract. For the Examiner's benefit, a marked-up copy of the specification and abstract indicating the changes made thereto is also enclosed. No new matter has been added by the revisions. Entry of the substitute specification is thus respectfully requested.

On pages 3-4 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-31 on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-10 of Takenaka et al. (US 7,181,839). In order to address this rejection, a terminal disclaimer has been submitted along with this Amendment. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's double patenting rejection is not applicable to the present application.

On pages 2-3 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1-31 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yasuhiro et al. (JP 11-238958). For the reasons discussed below, it is respectfully submitted that the amended claims are clearly patentable over the prior art of record.

Independent claim 6 recites a method of manufacturing a circuit board. The method of claim 6 includes preparing a pre-preg sheet including a substrate and a resin impregnated in the substrate, with the pre-preg sheet having a first surface and a second surface opposite to the first surface. Claim 6 also recites placing a first metal foil on the first surface of the pre-preg sheet to provide a laminated body, and compressing the laminated body at a temperature close to a softening temperature of the resin at a predetermined pressure. The method of claim 6 also

includes *cooling the laminated body to have a temperature not higher than the softening temperature of the resin after the compressing of the laminated body* at the predetermined pressure. Claim 6 further recites bonding the first metal foil to the pre-preg sheet of the laminated body and hardening the resin.

Yasuhiro discloses method of manufacturing a circuit board by a pressurized heating process. The pressurized heating process includes a first heating process in which the prepreg sheet 1 and the metal foils 4 are bonded to each other by pressure and heat, and a second process in which the thermosetting resin is cured through pressure and heat after the first process.

However, Yasuhiro does not disclose a method which includes *cooling the laminated body to have a temperature not higher than the softening temperature of the resin after the compressing of the laminated body at the predetermined pressure*, as required by independent claim 6. Yasuhiro only discloses a pressurized heating process which includes two different heating processes as described above, and does not disclose cooling the laminated body to have a temperature not higher than the softening temperature of the resin after the compressing of the laminated body, as required by independent claim 6.

Therefore, for the reasons presented above, it is believed apparent that the present invention as recited in independent claim 6 is not disclosed or suggested by the Yasuhiro reference. Accordingly, a person having ordinary skill in the art would clearly not have had a reason to modify the Yasuhiro reference in such a manner as to result in or otherwise render obvious the present invention of independent claim 6.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that independent claim 6, as well as claims 7, 19, 21, 23, 25, 27, 29 and 31-37 which depend therefrom, are clearly allowable over the prior art of record.

In addition, the Examiner's attention is directed to the dependent claims which further define the present invention over the prior art. For example, dependent claim 36 (which depends from independent claim 6) recites that the bonding of the first metal foil to the pre-preg sheet of the laminated body and hardening of the resin comprises bonding the first metal foil to the pre-preg sheet, and hardening the resin after the cooling of the laminated body. In addition,

JUL. 18. 2007 7:59PM

NO. 0794 P. 11

dependent claim 37 (which depends from claim 36) recites that the bonding of the first metal foil to the pre-preg sheet comprises bonding the first metal foil to the laminated body of the pre-preg sheet between the compressing of the laminated body and the cooling of the laminated body. It is respectfully submitted that the applied prior art does not disclose the limitations of dependent claims 36 and 37.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is clearly in condition for allowance. An early notice to that effect is respectfully solicited.

If, after reviewing this Amendment, the Examiner feels there are any issues remaining which must be resolved before the application can be passed to issue, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone in order to resolve such issues.

Respectfully submitted,

Yoshihiro KAWAKITA et al.

By:



Walter C. Pledger
Registration No. 55,540
Attorney for Applicants

WCP/ats
Washington, D.C. 20006-1021
Telephone (202) 721-8200
Facsimile (202) 721-8250
July 18, 2007